Must Free Speech Be Given Up to Get a Passport? See page 3

I. F. Stone's Weekly

WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS VOL. II, NUMBER 34 SEPTEMBER 27, 1954

Rallying Point: A Cease-Fire For Formosa

The most constructive news of the week was the proposal put forward by the American Association for the United Nations for a cease-fire on the Formosa straits. Though this was made to the U.S. delegation on the eve of the new meeting of the General Assembly, there is no reason why some neutral delegation should not take the initiative and formally move a resolution for a cease-fire. The air of unreality which lies like a thickening haze over the UN will deepen if it putters about dozens of minor issues while impotently ignoring the one point where world peace is in danger.

At the same time for those Americans who have been eager for some way to do something about peace, the AAUN resolution offers a focal point for grass roots action. Among the 46 organizations represented in the AAUN in drawing up the cease-fire and other resolutions were the A.F. of L., C.I.O. and the Machinists; Hadassah, the B'nai B'rith, the American Jewish Congress and the American Jewish Committee; AMVETS and the American Veterans Committee; the Methodist Board of World Peace and the American Friends Service Committee. A series of local meetings under AAUN auspices to discuss the danger and the issues would make a real contribution to peace.

The AAUN resolution says, "The United States should join in sponsoring or supporting a proposal that the United Nations, without regard to the question of recognition, as to which its members are presently divided, should at once call upon both the authorities now in control of the government on Formosa and the government now in control of the government on the mainland of China to cease the use of armed force against each other in this area in the interest of world peace, and further to accept the proposition that Formosa and the mainland of China shall not be united by force nor without the free consent of the people of Formosa and under conditions approved by the United Nations as consistent with world peace, security and justice."

The wording is roomy enough to save face all around and provide a breathing spell in solving the problem. It will not escape attention that the cease-fire will chiefly affect those who have been doing most of the firing—that is the Chiang forces, acting under American naval and air protection. The constant raids and bombings by the Nationalist forces, if continued, must force the Chinese Communists into war on Formosa, whether they and their Russian allies want it or not. In the current political atmosphere this means to risk World War III. A "limited" war between the U.S. and China would not be very limited very long, with Russian supplies pouring in and our trigger-happy military maniacs pushing á la MacArthur for atomic attack on a Soviet "sanctuary."

Are The Democrats for War or Peace?

The idea of the cease-fire should also be put up to local candidates of both parties. Last week Nixon challenged Adlai Stevenson to say where he and the Democrats stand. The Democrats ought not to be allowed to duck that challenge. Every one knows where Nixon stands. If he had had his way last spring we would have had war with China. Fortunately the conservative wing of the party and Eisenhower decided against him. But what would the Democrats have done about Indo-China? What do they propose to do about the Formosa fighting?

The value of the AAUN resolution is that it narrows the issue sharply. It puts to one side the question of what shall ultimately be done about Formosa. It focusses on one basic issue: stop the shooting from both sides over the Formosa straits to prevent a new war from breaking out. Where do the Democrats stand on that?

If the Democrats were not in such a cowardly and demagogic mood, their answer would be clear. This would be an issue made to order for them. After all, the cease-fire merely proposes a return to the Truman Formosan order when (on paper at least) we imposed peace on the straits, throwing a protective screen over Chiang Kai-shek but at the same time forbidding him to attack the mainland. A politic formula protecting both Formosa and world peace is possible within these confines.

Such sanity, unfortunately, seems to be beyond even the best of the Democrats at the moment, a fact which should have some weight with the voters. Whatever else may be said about Eisenhower, he *did* make peace in Korea and he *did not* go to war over Indo-China. But the Democrats who are so ready to support him on domestic measures, never seem to be willing to support him on steps toward peace. Stevenson fatuously intervened in France in support of EDC and German rearmament but his speech at Indianapolis was disgustingly dishonest when it touched on the Far East.

Stevenson spoke of the "familiar contradictions" of Republican policy and "the tough, noisy talk" but he made the same kind of talk, filled with the same contradictions. The climax of disingenuous demagogy was the statement, "In Asia the Communist triumph in Indo-China and the ominous preparations across the Formosa strait remind us that the President thought the armistice in Korea would be a fraud if it helped the Communists to advance elsewhere."

Those of us who cheered for Stevenson in 1952 must blush for such twisted phrases. The armistice in Korea did lead to an armistice in Indo-China. This, far from being a Com-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

munist triumph, was an armistice in which the Indo-Chinese revolutionists were high-pressured to accept much less by negotiation than they could have taken by force—a fact now being thrown up at them by the South Vietnam Nationalists in their recent radio broadcasts. As for the Formosa straits, what is "ominous" there are not the "preparations" on the mainland—these are still a matter of speculation. What is ominous is the constant attacks being made on the mainland by Chiang with American arms, ships and planes; this is ominous, because no government, even one as patient as Peking has shown itself to be, can long take this kind of offensive action without retaliating.

Even more ominous is the continued deterioration morally in the United States. We do not seem to realize that we are not watching a ball game, that people are being killed in the Chinese coastal cities by the air and artillery attacks we make possible. Our imaginations are so atrophied, our conditioned reflexes so set, we have all become such Pavlovian dogs of the China Lobby, that no one asks sensibly how we should feel if New York or San Francisco were being subjected to such attack by rebel forces from offshore islands. And even a man as big in vision as Stevenson, a man courageous enough to advocate the admission of Communist China to the UN two years ago, now talks such cheap nonsense and indulges in such tricky rhetoric on foreign policy.

What Makes John Foster Run (So Foolishly)?

Mr. Dulles's deliberate snub to Paris on his trip to Europe was so silly as to make one wonder who is advising the Secretary of State. The French position is a powerful one. West Europe cannot be held from Germany and the Low Countries. France is the essential bridgehead from a military point of view. In addition the French have effective means of vetoing German rearmament. It is not merely a question of the legal veto they possess as a member of NATO. They occupy one zone of Germany. We cannot give sovereignty and an Army to the British and American zones alone. The Reich would be split in three, instead of in two, as at present. This explains why the German press, instead of welcoming the rude treatment of the French, was appalled by it. One can only suspect that Mr. Dulles and the brainstorm idea of overturning Mendes-France by pressure from Washington and Bonn were inspired by the bitterness of Schumann and Bidault, whose judgment seems to have cracked under the strain of losing their Catholic monopoly of the Foreign Office.

The State Department continues to misread French politics. With de Gaullists calling for new negotiations with Russia on a unified and neutralized Germany and the pro-EDC Socialists bitterly opposed to a German national army, Mendès-France is not the saboteur of German rearmament but a man desperately trying to find some formula which will at one and the same time appease Washington yet command a majority in France. To pursue the present attitude in the present frame of mind leads straight in the direction of reviving the Franco-Polish and Franco-Soviet pacts, the only effective French protection against the danger that a reviving Germany may again make a deal with the Soviet East.

The whole idea of rearming Germany as protection against anything is criminal folly. This is like hiring a gangster to protect one against a competitor, in this case a gangster who has twice looted and wrecked one's own establishment. The publication in England last month of Lord Russell of Liverpool's terrible *The Scourge of the Swastika, a Short History of Nazi War Crimes* may serve as a grisly reminder of episodes Mr. Dulles would like us to forget. We are preparing to rearm people in too large measure still governed by the same men who created Dachau and Buchenwald, the crematorium and human soap. Behind and around the Old Fox from Cologne are the remnants of the same Nazi and militarist crew.

Will We Give The Germans The Atom Bomb, Too?

The point which most needs watching is the question of whether German sovereignty as demanded by Adenauer and supported by Dulles would include the right to make atomic weapons. A Germany armed with A and H bombs would soon be a world menace again because her military leaders would be far less hesitant than those of Russia and the U.S. to use the total weapon when it served their purposes.

It is important to recall that in the Japanese peace treaty, which was almost completely Dulles's handiwork, and where we had to pay little attention to the views of our allies, there is no restriction on the right of Japan to make atom bombs. When Senators Green and McMahon questioned Dulles about this in January, 1952, during the hearings on the treaty before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Dulles said such restrictions would have been "offensive to the Japanese" because it would have created "a second class sovereignty."

Dulles tried to disarm the Senators by saying that there were no fissionable materials in Japan and "in view of the very close control exercised by what we call the free world over that, Japan, as a practical matter, could not engage in atomic weapons without our consent." At the time the Senate committee commented in its report on the treaty that "the United States would be very much concerned if such research turned in the direction of weapons of destruction." But Atomic Energy Commissioner Murray last week proposed that as "a dramatic and Christian gesture" we give a power reactor to Japan. The rest of the East, which remembers the Japanese attack as vividly as France remembers the German invader, may think this gesture, like so much of the West's Christianity, a sour joke.

The negotiators at London had better ask Dulles whether he thinks it would be subjecting the Germans to "second class sovereignty" if they were forbidden to make atomic weapons. Our European allies may otherwise wake up one day to learn that we have given the Germans a reactor, too. Reactors produce power, but they also produce plutonium. Plutonium makes bombs, and it seems a little early to trust the Germans with such toys.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

State Department's Iron Curtain Challenged in Federal Court

Must Free Speech Be Abandoned as The Price of A Passport?

Washington—Two challenges to the State Department's own Iron Curtain are now before Federal Judge Schweinhaut in District Court here. One was brought by former Federal Judge William Clark, who was refused a passport to revisit Germany where he had been Chief Justice of the Allied High Commission Courts. The other, the first suit to test the Department's new passport appeals procedure, was brought by an internationally known economist, Dr. Otto Nathan, who was denied a passport though he signed the non-Communist affidavit required by the Department.

The Clark case is of particular interest because it involves the application to a respectable* of the Department's ruling against Paul Robeson. The famous singer's passport was cancelled in 1950 "because" (as the government's brief put it in *Robeson v. Acheson, 198 F 2d 985*), "the Department disapproved of the political thoughts . . . expressed by appellant at meetings outside the United States."

Robeson's appeal was dismissed as moot. Most people looked the other way because of his pro-Communist reputation. Few stopped to consider the precedent implied. Now it is being used against a conservative jurist who disagreed sharply with occupation policy.

Government counsel told Judge Schweinhaut that if Clark were given a passport to visit Germany he would criticize the soft policy towards ex-Nazis and added that this was the same accusation "made by Otto John." The U.S. Attorney cited the Robeson case as precedent.

Clark, perhaps suspecting that his passport application would be refused, appended to it a statement saying, "I would be less than frank if I did not state that I reserve to myself my fundamental right of free speech. I shall, accordingly, if I am asked to do so, make such comments as I see fit upon the recent controversy between me and the State Department. I shall feel free to object again to the State Department's having dismissed me and having me deported from Spain. I shall feel free to explain again my defense of the rights of American citizens in Germany. I shall not refrain from stating my well-known position on the right of bail and speedy trial in general, and particularly for American citizens residing in Germany, and my equally clear position decrying discrimination, against members of minority groups, in this instance particularly the Jews of Germany."

* The Chicago Tribune July 18 protested the denial of a passport to Clark and said, "If the rights of citizens abroad can be limited in this way, it is difficult to see why the government cannot assume the same power at home, forcing us all to root for its foreign policy, whether we like it or not."

State Dept. Rejects Bauer Decision

More than two years ago, on July 9, 1952, a three man Federal court held for the first time in *Bauer v. Acheson* (106 F. Supp. 445) that the State Department's power to issue or revoke passports was not unlimited, but subject to due process.

The Department did not appeal, but now in the pending William Clark passport case it argues that the Bauer case was "incorrectly decided" and that the requirement of a hearing before the invalidation of a passport "could result in irreparable damage to the United States."

The government cites the hypothetical case of a citizen who was indicted "for the crime of advocating the overthrow of our government" while travelling abroad and says he might "flee behind the iron curtain" if his passport could not be revoked without a hearing!

Form of Censorship

Morris L. Ernst, Clark's counsel, argued that under the power claimed by the State Department "any reporter or writer was in danger of being recalled if he was critical of the government or of its foreign policy." He added that under this rule, "McCarthy could not travel abroad, nor Adlai Stevenson."

The Department took the position that if Clark withdrew the appended statement, he could have a passport. Clark offered to withdraw the statement if the Department withdrew any implication that his freedom of speech abroad was limited. The Judge suggested that the two parties work out some compromise along this line, but as we went to press no compromise had been reached. The difficulty on the Department's side is that it does not wish in any way to imply that it cannot revoke a passport if it does not approve of what an American abroad says.

Next week: The Nathan case—Can Undisclosed Charges Be Used in Denying Passports?

Epilogue in Guatemala: As Seen by C.I.O. and A.F. of L.

". . . Associate Director of International Affairs, Daniel Benedict . . has just returned from a second trip to Guatemala since the overthrow of the Communist-dominated Arbenz government.

"On the first visit, Benedict . . . visited the new President, Carlos Castillo Armas, and heard his 'repeated assurances that there would be no attempt to hinder the development of free trade unionism and no attempt to destroy the land reform gains of the peasants.'

"'Yet non-Communist workers known for, or suspected of, strong trade union feelings have been and are now being fired by the scores' he (Benedict) said at the time. Upon his return from the second trip, late in August, Benedict reported finding arrests of workers with strong union sentiments continuing. Juridical recognition of many unions from which the Communist leaders had been removed . . . has been withdrawn, he said . . .

"The land reform program, which the Communists under the Arbenz dictatorship had exploited, is being wiped out, he reported. Many Indian peasants have been driven from their small farms by threats and intimidation by the former owners, he said, thus laying the ground-work for a revival of Communist strength."

—News from CIO, Int'l Ed., Sept. 10

"Unfortunately, this wave of anti-Communism threatened to sweep away the labor movement itself . . . The new Guatemalan government had made an exception to this pledge of maintaining the legal status of the unions by dissolving the Teachers', the Railway Union called SAMF, which was the strongest in the country, and two labor syndicates in the United Fruit Company's banana plantations . . . The three dissolved industrial unions operated in the jurisdiction of the United Fruit Company and of its subsidiary, the International Railway of Central America.

"It was, from all points of view, a serious blunder which damaged the prestige of the government among non-Communist trade-unionists and cast unfavorable reflections—to put it mildly—on the policy of the two American firms. It is generally accepted that the decree dissolving the banana workers' and the railway workers' unions . . . was issued at the insistent request of the American companies . . .

"Another factor which threatens . . . free trade union activity . . . is the policy of wholesale dismissals adopted by a number of large concerns. They plan to eliminate . . . not only Communist elements but also all those whom they classify as 'agitators' . . ."

—Report on Guatemala, by Serafino Romualdo, A.F. of L. Rep. for Latin America, American Federationist, Sept. 1954

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Satire Dedicated to the Embattled Teachers Union of New York

On The Need for A New View of Judas Iscariot

The New York City Board of Education is split. The question is whether teachers shall be required to inform on others in order to keep their jobs, despite an earlier promise that they need only answer questions about their own political past.

So great is the confusion and so persistent the feeling against informing that even Mr. William Jansen, the superintendent of schools, himself one of the prime movers in the scholastic Red hunt, seems to falter at imposing this requirement. This queasy attitude puts these recalcitrants in conflict with Mr. J. Edgar Hoover.

If the FBI is to fulfill the enormous tasks now imposed upon it, there must be a change in the attitude toward informers. The job of keeping subversives out of government, industry, communications, the arts, the sciences and the professions, requires a multitude of dossiers. These can only be accumulated if from their earliest days in school Americans are trained to report those tell-tale symptoms of nonconformity among their fellows which may indicate hidden subversion or conspiracy.

This new attitude can hardly be inculcated in American youth if their teachers are allowed with impunity to indulge the old-fashioned prejudice against informers. The need is evident for a campaign of re-education.

As the *Weekly's* own contribution to these patriotic necessities, we would like to touch upon a delicate subject. Far more influential than the gangster movies which teach contempt for the stoolpigeon are those first Sunday school lessons which portray an informer, Judas Iscariot, as the arch-villain of the Saviour's appearance on earth. To be called "a Judas" is to make men's spirits shrivel on the very brink of their new obligations

At first glance this formidable block seems irremovable unless one were, like the German Fascists, to attack the Christian religion altogether as a source of womanish scruples. Such extreme measures I believe unnecessary. A study of the Gospels and the Church Fathers will show that with a little thought and effort the common view of Judas Iscariot may be recast. I throw out, on a purely amateur basis, a few leads which skilled theologians might utilize.

From earliest times there was dissatisfaction with the notion that Judas betrayed his Master for a handful of silver. We learn from two of the Church Fathers, Irenaeus and Epiphanius, that there was a lost Gospel of Judas which pictured the Informer as the greatest of the Apostles, "the perfect Gnostic."

As one modern writer (S. Baring Gould: *The Lost and Hostile Gospels*) has summarized their view: "The other apostles, narrowed by their prejudices, had opposed the idea of the death of Christ . . . But Judas, having a clearer vision of the truth, and the necessity for the redemption of the world by the death of Christ, took the heroic resolution to make that precious sacrifice inevitable." Thus the whole great Drama of Salvation was only made possible by the sacrifices of this far-seeing Informer.

De Quincey in a little known essay on Judas Iscariot also rejected "the vulgar reading of the case" and saw in him "a spasmodic effort of vindictive patriotism and of rebellious motive." De Quincey suggested that Judas informed on Jesus only in order to precipitate a national revolt against the Romans. This would picture the Great Informer as a tragic patriot.

Another possibility is opened up by a recent secular author. His interpretation is said to be that Judas was a leading Palestinian liberal won to the new faith in the mistaken belief that it was only heresy. When party slogans about making Jesus "King of the Jews" opened his eyes to realities, he went and did his duty as a loyal Roman subject.

According to this version, probably apocryphal, Judas manfully summed up his position to the Romans in words as succinct as anything in Tacitus, saying "Heresy, Yes. Conspiracy, No . . ."

Surely from such elements some public-spirited divine, perhaps aided by an FBI fellowship, could fashion a wholesome picture of Judas for our youth.

LET US SEND A SAMPLE COPY TO A FRIEND

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 301 E. Capitol, Wash. 3, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:

Name_____

Street_____

City_____ Zone_____ State_____

Enter this gift sub for $4 more (money enclosed):

(To) Name_____

Street_____

City_____ Zone_____ State_____

9-27-54

I. F. Stone's Weekly
Room 205
301 E. Capitol St., S.E.
Washington 3, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as
Second Class Mail
Matter
Washington, D. C.
Post Office

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED